



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,062	10/30/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10007669-1	8476

7590

09/07/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

POWERS, WILLIAM S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,062

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

William S. Powers

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/30/2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/30/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code: page 6, line 2. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Not all of the hyperlinks were deleted. The disclosure has an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code: page 6, line 2. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. The objection is not withdrawn.

2. The paragraph that starts on page 19, line 18, as it is a word for word copy of the 2 sentences that immediately precede it.

In view of applicant's amendments, this objection is withdrawn.

3. Change "an graphic..." (page 26, line 13) to "a graph..." In view of applicant's amendments, this objection is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

4. In view of applicant's amendments, all claim objections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-10, 12-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,908 to Lagarde et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,675 to Smith.

Regarding claim 1 Lagarde et al provides a browser to access a Web service and download content (column 9, lines 10-11; column 10, lines 16-20), retrieves image data under the control of the browser (column 5, lines 16-24), uses password authorizations and obtaining "information from confidential source[s]" (column 10, lines 53-56), but does not, specifically, disclose the use of public/private encryption, encrypting data, transmitting of said encrypted data or decrypting said encrypted data.

Smith teaches that the client downloads the public key from the server, encrypts the data, transmits said encrypted data to said server and said server decrypts said data using private key counterpart to said public key (column 6, lines 27-39) in order to effect secure document delivery.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of Lagarde et al with the specific

security features disclosed by Smith to ensure secure data transmission to the web service.

Regarding claim 12, since claim 12 recites a computer that performs the same method steps of claim 1, the rejection is applied.

Regarding claim 18, since claim 18 recites a system that performs the same method steps of claim 1 with the addition of a data path which is disclosed by Lagarde et al (column 9, lines 2-6), the rejection is applied.

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Lagarde discloses retrieved data that is associated with user's identity (column 5, lines 13-24).

Regarding claims 3, 14 and 18 Lagarde discloses the destination web service represents a production device (column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Lagarde discloses the production device is a printer (column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 5, Lagarde discloses a method whereby the web service has restricted access to user's data (column 12, lines 29-39).

Regarding claim 6, Lagarde and Smith do not disclose a hard disk.

Official Notice is given that it is well known that modern computer systems employ hard disks as secondary memory.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Lagarde and Smith using a hard disk for secondary memory.

Regarding claim 7, Lagarde discloses various document forms including BMP and GIF files, but PDF is not mentioned, specifically (column 17-18, lines 56-67 and 1-3).

Smith teaches, by way of example, securely transmitting a PDF file over the network (column 5, lines 46-56).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of Lagarde with the PDF format document disclosed by Smith.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Lagarde discloses options presented by the destination web service for the user to choose according to his/her needs (column 10, lines 37-41).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, Lagarde discloses printing and/or producing results of the user's options (column 15, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 10, Lagarde discloses printing reports reflecting user's desired options (column 14-15, lines 62-67 and 1-32).

Regarding claim 20, Lagarde discloses hard wired and wireless data paths (column 9, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 21, Lagarde in view of Smith disclose a public encryption key (Smith, column 4, lines 45-51).

6. Claims 11, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,908 to Lagarde et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,675 to Smith in further view of Applied Cryptography by Bruce Schneier.

Lagarde and Smith teach security measures, but do not, specifically, disclose the use of a session key.

Schneier teaches "a hybrid cryptosystem" (page 33, 5th paragraph) wherein a session key is generated that encrypts the data, uses the public key to encrypt the session key and sends the session key and data to the destination where the private key counterpart decrypts the session key and the session key decrypts the data (page 33, paragraphs 6-9) in order to more effectively use the computer system resources.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to institute the session key encryption scheme, as disclosed by Schneier, as this better utilizes computer resources.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1 and 12, the claims recite that the user downloads "into said browser a public encryption key associated with said accessed destination web service". The claim does not state that the public encryption key comes from said destination web service; it says that the public encryption key is associated with said destination web service (emphasis added). Smith teaches "encrypt[ing] the document with the public key of a server associated with the recipient of the document" (column 4, lines 4-7 emphasis added). The server, in one embodiment, is "isolated from the network by a firewall" (column 6, line 32) "within a private, supervised intranet or other

secure network" (column 6, lines 39-42) and is "readily deliverable to a recipient" (column 6, line 45) such as a printer or facsimile machine (column 5, lines 10-13). Thus, the server is associated with the recipient of the document. Therefore, the rejections stand.

As to claim 18, Smith teaches an embodiment where the server decrypts the encrypted document with the private key counterpart of the public key (column 6, lines 24-46). The server is "a private, supervised intranet or other secure network" (column 6, lines 40-42) where the decrypted document is forwarded to a service such as a printer or fax machine (column 5, lines 10-13). In this case the server is a destination that represents a service. Thus, the rejection stands.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,438,594 to Bowman-Amuah discloses delivering services via a locally addressable interface.

U.S. Patent No. 6,144,997 to Lamming et al discloses a system for accessing and distributing electronic documents.

U.S. Patent No. 6,105,131 to Carroll discloses a secure distributed information system.

U.S. Patent No. 6,718,535 to Underwood discloses a network for the distribution of services.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William S. Powers, whose telephone number is (571) 272-8573. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8 AM – 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (886) 217-9197 (toll-free).


WSP

August 22, 2005

